

REMARKS

With respect to the disclosure objections listed in the Office Action at page 2, paragraph 1, items a., c., d., and e. have been overcome by the above corrective amendments to the specification.

The word "salvo" on specification page 6 has been replaced with "burst" which is a more idiomatic translation of the original French word.

Applicant also requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to claim 2, in view of the above corrective amendments thereof.

Applicant also respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

As for claims 1 and 6, and the meaning of "all processing operations", Applicant respectfully submits that such meaning is, in fact, "clear" when the clause containing the modifier "all" is read in conjunction with the following clause containing the expression "applies to said user data only said processing operations needed to..."; in this regard, see the reworded and rewritten claims 2 (2/1) and 7 (7/6).

With respect to lines 12, 13 and lines 20-21 of the original claims 1 and 6, respectively, Applicant has omitted "without reproducing" from the rewritten (allowable) claims 2 (2/1) and 7 (7/6).

Applicant does not understand why it is "not clear" whether claim 6 defines a "method" or a "device".

Claim 6 has been canceled, and the new independent "device" claim is claim 7 (7/6) which clearly claims a "communication **device** integrating at least two separate send/receive interfaces...". This claimed device implements the method of parent claim 1 and/or 2, which method is recited in the "device" claim. (As the Examiner will note from the already submitted certified copy of the foreign priority application, claim 6 is written therein as a "device" claim dependent on the parent "method" claim.)

In claims 2 and 7, the slashes (/) merely separate the series of recited sequence steps (see Figs. 1 and 2), all of which are included or excluded as defined by the language of the claims. (Even though the slash marks could be replaced by commas, Applicant respectfully submits that the intended meanings of claims 2 and 7 are perfectly clear as written; however, if the Examiner should disagree, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney to discuss the matter.)

The Examiner **rejected only claims 1, 5, 6, 10 and 11**, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Leslie '775. Even though Applicant does not acquiesce in this rejection, in order to obtain an early allowance of the application, Applicant has canceled the rejected independent claims 1 and 6, and amended claims 5, 10 and 11 to be dependent on the (allowable) claims 2-4, 7-9, 12 and 13 which were **not rejected on prior art**. Furthermore, Applicant has rewritten the **allowable** (i.e., not rejected on prior art) claims 4/1, 9/6, 12/11/6 and 13/11/6 as **new claims 14, 15, 16 and 17**, respectively, whereby these new claims also should be **allowable** on the prior art.

In summary, then, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all requirements, objections and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and to find the


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 09/865,673

application to be in condition for allowance with all of **claims 2-5 and 7-17**; however, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant files concurrently herewith an Excess Claim Fee Payment Letter with a fee of \$600.00 to cover the cost of the three excess independent claims generated by this Amendment.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



John H. Mion
Registration No. 18,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 2, 2005